R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 933 48

REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (1959-60).

BY- BALAKIAN, ANNA
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-27 PUB DATE 60
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.52 38P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STATISTICAL SURVEYS, STATISTICAL DATA, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, SECONDARY SCHOOLS, *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *TEACHER CERTIFICATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

THIS RESEARCH REPORTS THE RESULTS OF A STATISTICAL SURVEY OF CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS. DATA COLLECTED FROM REPLIES OF QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO STATE CERTIFICATION OFFICERS INDICATED THAT A SHIFT IS TAKING PLACE IN THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF APPLICANTS FROM THE STATE CERTIFICATION BOARDS TO THE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING CONCERNED WITH THEIR TRAINING. THE RESULTS SHOW A PRESSING NEED FOR CLOSER SCRUTINY OF COLLEGE CURRICULUMS IN THIS FIELD IN ORDER TO EFFECT AGREEMENT ON STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT. (GD)

ED003933

THE RESEARCH REPORTED HEREIN WAS PERFORMED PURSUANT TO A CONTRACT WITH THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION - FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM RESEARCH CENTER

70 Fifth Avenue - New York 11, N. Y.

STATISTICAL SURVEY PROJECT

Requirements for Certification of Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages in Public Secondary and Elementary Schools (1959-60)

FOREWORD

This three-part survey of modern foreign language certification requirements and practices was made possible through the information supplied by Education Department officials on the state and municipal levels. The qualifications here reported and analyzed pertain only to the foreign language concentration and do not include academic degree and professional education requirements except in the case of the certification of teachers of foreign languages in the elementary schools (FLES) when the secondary school certificate is especially endorsed for FLES by the addition of training in professional education. Inquiries concerning other information about conditions of certification may be addressed to the Certification Officers listed in this report. The total and wholehearted cooperation which I received fromthem in conducting this study is gratefully acknowledged.

Anna Balakian
Research Associate, MLA

New York University
June 9, 1960

CONTENTS

Foreword . . . . . .

State Certification Standards for the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary Schools . . . . . .

Municipal Standards of Teacher Certification in the Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary Schools . . . . . .

The Certification of Teachers of Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools . . . . . .

STATE CERTIFICATION STANDARDS FOR THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

This survey of certification procedures and qualifications for the teaching of modern foreign languages in the public secondary schools of the United States was conducted as part of the Statistical Research Project of the Modern Language Association under a contract with the U. S. Office of Education authorized under the National Defense Education Act. It is a subject that has interested the MLA periodically in the course of the past thirty years, and the results of previous investigations in this field have been published in PMLA and The Modern Language Journal. The two most recent ones were directed in 1954 by John Fisher, then Treasurer of the MLA, and in 1955-56 by William R. Parker, then Executive Secretary of the MLA, with the assistance of Louise Combs, Director of Certification in Kentucky. These previous inquiries pointed out the ambiguity in the counting of "credit-hour" requirements and uncertainty concerning the relationship between conditions of certification and practices of employment. They also revealed great disparity in standards of measurement of competency in this field. Although the Manual on Certification Requirements, published by the National Education Association, gives up-to-date information about credit-hour requirements for the teaching of most subjects on the high school level, it does not reveal some factors relating to certification which are of concern to teachers of modern foreign languages.

The current study primarily sought:

1. To ascertain whether any progress has been made in the last few years toward a more homogeneous standard of measurement of the competence of teacher applicants in the field of modern foreign languages in the various States.

2. To determine whether in this connection any of the recommendations of the Modern Language Association for the evaluation of competence had affected State certification.

3. To discover to what extent the unqualified were still actively engaged in this teaching field.

With these objectives in view, letters were addressed to the State Certification Directors requesting them to give information concerning the following questions about certification:

1. Did the credit-hour requirements stated in the Manual on Certification or in the Certification Bulletin of the individual States include all college credit in the language regardless of level? If so, was the number of hours reduced when the applicant had high school units in the language?

2. To what extent were State Certification agencies considering the speaking knowledge of the language as a significant condition of certification?

3. To what extent were State Certification Officers considering the

possibilities of facilitating the certification of individuals whose general educational training and language competencies had been acquired abroad?

4. Were any of these agencies contemplating any significant changes in certification policy which would in the next year or two affect the teaching of modern foreign languages in the secondary schools of their State?

Here are the facts disclosed by a complete response to this inquiry and verified through a resubmission of the data after a tentative tabulation. As far as it is possible to determine, this information is, therefore, accurate as of June 1, 1960. Explanation of the abbreviations will facilitate the reading of the chart.

Explanation of Abbreviated Terms

MINIMUM FOR MAJOR FL. Semester credit hours required for the teaching of a single foreign language.

MINIMUM FOR A SECOND FL. Semester credit hours required to teach a second foreign language when the candidate is already qualified to teach the first foreign language.

MINIMUM FOR A TWO-LANGUAGE MAJOR. Semester credit hours required when accreditation is based on the sum total of credit hours accumulated in the study of more than one language.

NEW REQUIREMENTS. Qualifications already acted upon by State Boards of Education.

PROPOSALS FOR NEW REQUIREMENTS. The current plans of certification committees. These changes are reported as pending.

COLLEGE ENDORSEMENT. The recommendation of the applicant by the institution in which he has accumulated the necessary credit hours is considered a condition of certification.

DUAL PLAN. A certificate to teach the FL may be obtained in one of two ways: a) through fulfillment of credit-hour requirements; b) through college endorsement of the applicant's qualifications.

CONSIDERING REVISION. States which either have indicated that they have a committee actively at work on revision of FL requirements, or that they are now undergoing complete revision of their general certification requirements.

STUDYING POSSIBILITY OF REVISION. States which expressed the need for revision of their requirements.

CERTIFICATION CONDITIONS FOR TEACHERS OF FL EDUCATED ABROAD. These conditions are in four categories:

Condition I (Cit.): U. S. citizenship or declaration of intention is obligatory.
Condition II (USOE): Evaluation of credentials is referred to the U. S. Office of Education.
Condition III (Local): Local evaluation is made on an individual basis.

Condition IV (Spec.Cert.): A special or provisional certificate is issued, and normal requirements are temporarily waived until an equivalence of credentials is proved or certification deficiencies are fulfilled.

H.S. Maximum number of college semester credit hours allowed for the study of the FL in high school. Two H. S. units equal six college semester credit hours.
COL. Number of semester credit hours of college work needed regardless of level of courses taken.
GR. Number of semester credit hours on graduate level needed for permanent certification.

	Minimum Semester Hours for Major FL	Minimum Sem. Hrs. for 2nd FL	Min. Sem. Hrs. for a 2-lang. Major	New Requirements and Date	Proposal for New Requirements	College Endorsement	Dual Plan	Considering Revision	Studying Possibility of Revision	Conditions for Applicants from Abroad
Alabama	18									USOE
Alaska	15	12				x				
Arizona	6 H.S. + 9[1] or 15			3H.S. + 15 or 18 (1961)						
Arkansas	18				non-specified proposals					Spec. Cert.
California	36 incl. 6 GR	20						x		Cit. & Local
Colorado	12			16 by Sept. 1960 18 by Sept. 1962						USOE & Local
Connecticut	18	12			6 Introductory + 18					Cit.
Delaware	24							x		USOE
Florida	24[2]	18[2]								Spec. Cert.
Georgia	6 H.S. + 20 or 27									Local & Spec. Cert.

1 For schools that are members of the North Central Assoc. only; for State approved schools it is 4H.S. 5 or 9 sem. hrs.
2 Effective July 1960

	Minimum Semester Hours for Major FL	Min. Sem. Hrs. for 2nd FL	Min. Sem. Hrs. for a 2-Lang. Major	New Requirements and Date	Proposal for New Requirements	College Endorsement	Dual Plan	Considering Revision	Studying Possibility of Revision	Conditions for Applicants from Abroad
Massachusetts	18	9								Cit. Local & Spec.Cert.
Michigan	24	15			30 for 1st FL 20 for 2nd FL					Cit. & Spec. Cert.
Minnesota	6 H.S.+ 9 or 15								x	Local
Mississippi	6 H.S.+ 12 or 18				24					Spec. Cert.
Missouri	5 H.S.+ 15 or 20				24[1]				x	Local & Spec. Cert.
Montana	20		30 in 2 FL 40 in 3 FL			x[2]			x	Cit. & Spec. Cert.
Nebraska	15[3] 12[4] (+ 9 GR)[5]		24[3] 18[4]							Spec. Cert.
Nevada	24					x				Spec. Cert.
New Hampshire	6 H.S.+ 12 or 18				30 Col. Endorse.[9] (18 for 1st FL) (12 for 2nd FL)					
New Jersey	24[5] 18[7]	18								

1 Minimum requirement in most other fields
2 Basis of cert. as of 1 July 1959
3 In accredited schools
4 In approved schools
5 For permanent cert.
6 If FL is major endorsement on license
7 If FL is a minor endorsement
8 Must file intention of becoming citizen
9 Must certify speaking skill

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

	Minimum Semester Hours for Major FL	Minimum Sem. Hrs. for 2nd FL	Minimum Sem. Hrs. for a 2-Lang. Major	New Requirements and Date	Proposal for New Requirements	College Endorsement	Dual Plan	Considering Revision	Studying Possibility of Revision	Conditions for Applicants from Abroad
New Mexico	18[1]					x				Local
New York	6 H.S. + 12 or 18 6 H.S. + 18 or 24[2]	6 H.S. 12[2]			24 + 12 GR Col. Endorsement	x				
North Carolina	6 H.S. + 24 or 30									Local
North Dakota	30	15		may teach only in major or minor field						Cit. & Spec.Cert.
Ohio	6 H.S. + 20 or 26	20								USOE & Local
Oklahoma	6 H.S. + 18 or 24									USOE
Oregon	20	20						x		Cit. & Local
Pennsylvania	18			1963: 36 or (24 for 1st FL) (12 for 2nd FL)						Spec. Exam.
Rhode Island	15							x		
South Carolina	6 H.S. + 18 or 24	12	6 H.S. + 30							USOE & Spec. Cert.

1 Effective 29 Feb. 1960

2 For permanent certification

	Minimum Semester Hours for Major FL	Minimum Sem. Hrs. for 2nd FL	Minimum Sem. Hrs. for a 2-Lang. Major	New Requirements and Date	Proposal for New Requirements	College Endorsement	Dual Plan	Considering Revision	Studying Possibility of Revision	Conditions for Applicants from Abroad
South Dakota	15					x				Spec. Cert.
Tennessee	6 H.S.+ 18 or 24	6 H.S. + 12	6 H.S. + 30			x				Local
Texas	24	18	36 in 2 FL			x			x	Local
Utah	20	12			23 for 1st FL 14 for 2nd FL	x				USOE & Local
Vermont	24	12			32 for 1st FL 16 for 2nd FL				x	Spec. Cert.
Virginia[1]	6 H.S.+ 18 or 24	18								Cit. & USOE
Washington	24[2]			College Endorsement as of April 4, 1960		x				Spec. Cert.
West Virginia	24	18							x	Cit. & Spec.Cert.
Wisconsin	24	15				x	x[3]	x		USOE Local & Spec. Cert.
Wyoming	24	15				x				Cit.

1 Effective Jan.1960

2 By annual accreditation the license is approved for FL teaching

3 When college endorsement is accepted as equivalent to credit-hour requirement, the licensing is, of course, still done by the State.

What Do The Figures Mean?

There is no indication from any State that the number of credit hours required may be reduced because of the shortage of qualified teachers. On the contrary, a number of States are actively at work to raise their requirements. Four (Florida, New Mexico, Virginia, Washington) have raised them in the first six months of 1960. Four others (Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Pennsylvania) will do so in the next year or two. North Dakota has sharpened without raising its requirement. Specific proposals for raising requirements are before the Boards of Education of nine States: Connecticut, Idaho, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Utah, Vermont. Sixteen are studying possibilities of raising requirements: Arkansas, California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin. Of these sixteen, two (Illinois and Missouri) have already passed on revisions but are considering additional changes. Four others upgraded their requirements in 1959: Kansas, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wyoming. It would appear, then, that only fourteen are in a static situation, some of them for the very good reason that they rank among the States that have the highest requirements. Many emphasize the fact that whatever their current figures may be, these are minimum requirements, and that they really expect much more from their teachers of foreign languages.

The comparison between States as to their credit-hour requirement for the teaching of modern foreign languages still remains very difficult despite efforts to pinpoint the exact nature of the given figures. The reason for this difficulty is that some States allow credit for the study of the foreign language in high school--making it possible to decrease the minimum college requirement by six hours--and others require the same set figure regardless of prior study in high school; therefore, in some States there is no way to determine whether the candidate is offering eighteen hours from a beginning in college, or structured upon two, three, or four solid years of high school training. There are also some States which frankly cannot tell if they count requirements from a beginning in college. Miss Louise Combs made a survey in this connection within the State of Kentucky to determine whether the colleges in that State counted the elementary work in their computation of "major" concentration. Her findings revealed that some of the ambiguity in the Office of Certification stems from the uncertainty in the departments of foreign languages in the institutions which train the teachers.

The figures presented in this report, therefore, must be regarded from two points of view. The first consideration, based on face value, reveals the following: the lowest official requirement is twelve semester hours (Colorado), and the highest, thirty-six, (California). Four States (Hawaii, Indiana, North Carolina, North Dakota) require thirty hours; Georgia requires twenty-seven; Ohio, twenty-six. Twenty States require twenty-four hours: Delaware, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Four States require twenty hours: Missouri, Montana, Oregon, and Utah; nine require eighteen: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania. Illinois requires sixteen hours, and eight States require fifteen: Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Rhode Island, and South Dakota. But the second consideration,

which takes into account the allowance that eighteen States make for high-school credits, reveals that not one but seven States (Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire) certify with twelve or less credit hours of college foreign language study, and though it appeared that twenty-seven States require twenty-four or more credit hours, the figure drops to nineteen States: California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

On the question of measurement of audio-lingual competence, the answers significantly demonstrate that the State Officers are ready to pass the responsibility to the institutions training the teachers. They agree that it is an important factor in judging competence, but they further assume that teachers who have drawn up recommendations such as those of the MLA would also be careful to uphold these standards in regard to the trainees in their departments of foreign languages. Miss Louise Combs defines the division of responsibility as follows:

> In regard to the second objective, I can only say the competencies of foreign language teachers are really determined by the college. Each institution develops its own program and recommends to us the issuance of the certificate when the person has finished the program to the satisfaction of the college. We at the State level have not identified the competencies for foreign language teachers as a focus for the program.

It is further assumed that the colleges themselves recognize the importance of audio-lingual proficiency:

> The general attitude of the State Department, then, is to expect the colleges to raise the level of their requirements for teachers, especially in the audio-lingual area,

writes Miss Sara W. Whitten, Supervisor of Modern Foreign Language Instruction in Tennessee. In even stronger language the Director of Teacher Education and Certification in New Jersey, Mr. Allan F. Rosebrock, states the assumption:

> Certainly we would not expect a teacher-training institution to give a satisfactory grade to a person who was preparing to be a language teacher if that person's speaking ability was not adequate to command respect.

And Mr. Eugene Richardson of Michigan, Consultant in Higher Education and Certification, sums up the consensus of his colleagues when he writes:

> We presume that it is the responsibility of the recommending institution to guarantee that the prospective language teacher will have competence in his field.

In fact, not one State has as yet been spurred to set up a testing machinery for oral approval as a result of the MLA recommendations, and New York State, which had an artificial one in the form of a written test to prove oral competence, has just eliminated it. In short, the trend in

certification of foreign language teachers is to unload this responsibility upon the institutions granting the academic degrees. Fifteen States (Alaska, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington,Wisconsin, Wyoming) will not grant a license without the endorsement of the applicant by an approved college. In two of these, Kansas and Wisconsin, there is actually a dual plan of certification which makes the passing of a test administered by the college and the recommendation by the appropriate dean the equivalent of the required number of credit hours for certification. In line with this thinking, many of the State Boards of Education have set up advisory committees which consist partially or completely of foreign language specialists. Speaking of one such committee set up in Wisconsin to upgrade standards for certification of foreign language teachers, Mr. R. W. Lewis, First Assistant Superintendent, writes:

> Should that committee--which was invited to study this matter two or three years ago--fail to produce anything, I shall plan to work out something within the department, but I would prefer to have the leadership come from the field.

On the question of the accreditation of candidates educated abroad and proficient in the language with an academic background equal to our B. A., the answers were for the most part elusive. Eight States ignored the question or considered it purely hypothetical. Even follow-up reminders brought forth no reply. Eleven others (California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, Wyoming) asserted that such individuals could not in any way be considered for certification until they became citizens of the United States. Montana suggested that if the alien applicant filed intention of becoming a citizen, he could be considered for certification on the basis of his other qualifications, and Maryland wrote that a waiver of citizenship could be made in such cases. In twenty-one States there are provisions to grant special or temporary certificates to such candidates and waivers or postponements of standard requirements in professional education if the credentials are deemed adequate after evaluation by a local university or the U. S. Office of Education. The State of Kansas has a special committee to take care of this problem.

> We have established a Review Committee and given it blanket authority to recommend to our Department of Education the certification of teachers whose qualifications differ from our requirement but are regarded as equivalent to the preparation which we require. Under this latter authority we issue about five or six[FL] certificates a year.

writes M. F. Floyd Herr, Director of Certification of that State. This is a problem that will grow more and more important in view of the current shortage of American teachers of foreign languages, particularly if Russian is introduced in any marked degree into the secondary school curriculum in the near future.

In regard to the number of non-qualified persons teaching foreign languages in the public secondary schools, the data that came out of this inquiry were fragmentary. Only thirteen States had statistical bureaus that

could even attempt to identify all those who taught foreign languages in their school systems, and even in these cases the figures could not be very accurate because of the number that still teach foreign languages under "blanket" certification. Although these "blanket" certificates still exist in a considerable number of States, there is an encouraging change in the actual use of them. In an increasing number of cases the "blanket" license is amended in terms of actual employment by the provision that the applicant may teach only in his major or minor area of specialization, even if the license does not specify what these areas are.

Conclusion

In general, the significant trend revealed in the survey is not an increase in the credit-hour requirements but the shift that is taking place in the responsibility for the accreditation of applicants from the State Certification Boards to the institutions of higher education occupied with their training. This would suggest both more flexibility of evaluation of the applicant's proficiency and also the possibility of more direct application of homogeneous standards to the evaluation of the individual in the several areas of competency. This would imply that departments of foreign languages in the colleges and universities will have more and more control over the quality of instruction in the foreign languages in the high schools; with the privilege will go the responsibility of accurate evaluation and the possible need for a sharpening of the relationship between the applicant's attainment and his academic grades. One can also conclude from the replies of the State Certification Officers that the requirements that do prevail are for the most part open to revision. The statement of Miss Genevieve Starcher, Director of Certification for the State of West Virginia, is representative of a predominant attitude in this respect:

> I assure you that we are not afraid to do things differently and will be amenable to the findings of your committee.

This highlights the pressing need for close scrutiny of college curricula in this field in order to bring these courses of study in line with the objectives that the profession has defined for itself with respect to the teaching of modern foreign languages.

The following persons contributed the data contained in this report:

ALABAMA. Bessie G. Hawthorne, Cert. Secretary, Montgomery 4.

ALASKA. Herbert Bruce, Ed. Supervisor, Science, Math., FLs, Juneau.

ARIZONA. C. B. Coor, Director of Secondary Ed., *Phoenix.

ARKANSAS. Ed McCuistion, Asst. Comm. Instructional Services, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA. Carl A. Larson, Specialist in Teacher Ed., Sacramento 14.

COLORADO, Otto G. Ruff, Director of Teacher Ed. & Cert., Denver.

CONNECTICUT. James S. LeSure, Consultant, Teacher Cert., Hartford, Box 2219.

DELAWARE. Ruth S. Jones, Supervisor, Teacher Cert., *Dover.

FLORIDA. J. T. Kelley, Director, Div. of Teacher Ed., Tallahassee.

GEORGIA. Jack P. Nix, Supervisor, Office of Teacher Cert., Atlanta 3.

HAWAII. Richard K. Mizuta, Asst. in Personnel Administration, *Honolulu.

IDAHO. Jane J. Scott, Supervisor, Modern FLs, Statehouse, Boise.

ILLINOIS. Robert O. de Vette, FL Consultant, *Springfield.

INDIANA. Ernest A. Smith, Director, Div. of Teacher Licensing, *Indianapolis 4.

IOWA. Wayland W. Osborn, Director, Div. of Teacher Ed., *Des Moines 19.

KANSAS. F. Floyd Herr, Director of Cert., *Topeka.

KENTUCKY. Louise Combs, Director, Div. of Teacher Ed., Frankfort.
William C. Sanders, Jr., Supervisor of Cert., Frankfort.

LOUISIANA. James Sylvest, Supervisor, Teacher Ed., Baton Rouge 4.

MAINE. Nita Barbour, Supervisor of Modern FLs, Augusta.

MARYLAND. W. T. Boston, Director of Cert. & Accreditation, Baltimore 1.

MASSACHUSETTS. John P. McGrail, Director of Teacher Cert., Boston 16.
Raymond S. Dower, Jr.,Supervisor in Ed., Boston 16.

MICHIGAN. Eugene Richardson, Consultant, Higher Ed. & Cert., *Lansing.

MINNESOTA. F. E. Heinemann, Director, Teacher Personnel Section,St. Paul 1.

MISSISSIPPI. Bilbo Young, Supervisor Teacher Ed., Jackson.

MISSOURI. Paul Greene, Director, Teacher Ed. & Cert., Jefferson City.

MONTANA. Parks Whitmer, Director, Teacher Cert., Helena.
Lester W. McKim, Supervisor, Modern FLs, Helena.

NEBRASKA. LeRoy Ortgiesen, Asst. Commissioner, Div. of Administration, Lincoln 9.

NEVADA. Charles O. Ryan, Deputy Superintendent, Carson City.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. C. Paul Quimby, Director, Secondary School Services, Concord.
James C. Faulkner, Director, FL Ed., Concord.

NEW JERSEY. Allan F. Rosebrock, Director, Teacher Ed., Trenton 25.

NEW MEXICO. La Mar Lamb, Director, Div. of Cert., Santa Fe.

NEW YORK. Vincent C. Gazzetta, Associate in Teacher Cert., Albany 1.
Paul M. Glaude, Supervisor of FL Ed., Albany 1.

NORTH CAROLINA. Mary Alice Poor, Supervisor of Cert.,*Raleigh.

NORTH DAKOTA. Lorene York, Director of Cert., *Bismarck.

OHIO. Albert C. May, Director, Div. of Teacher Ed., Columbus 15.

OKLAHOMA. E. H. Bingham, Director of Cert., Oklahoma City.

OREGON. Dick Sorick, Director, Teacher Ed., Salem.
Paul M. Arriola, Consultant in FLs, Salem.

PENNSYLVANIA. Catherine Coleman, Director, Bureau of Teacher Ed., *Harrisburg.

RHODE ISLAND. W. P. Robinson, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of Ed., Providence 8.

SOUTH CAROLINA. S. C. Hawkins, Supervisor, Teacher Ed., Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA. Tillie Snyder, Director, Cert., *Pierre.

TENNESSEE. Sara W. Whitten, Supervisor, Modern FLs, Nashville 3.

TEXAS. Milo E. Kearney, Director, Teacher Ed., Austin.

UTAH. N. Blaine Winters, Director of Accreditation, *Salt Lake City 14.
J. Dale Miller, Supervisor, Modern FLs, Salt Lake City 14.

VERMONT. Louis DesChenes, Consultant in Modern FLs, Montpelier.

VIRGINIA. Fred O. Wygal, Director, Teacher Ed., Richmond 16.

WASHINGTON. Nels W. Hanson, Supervisor of Science, Math., & FLs, *Olympia.

WEST VIRGINIA. Genevieve Starcher, Director, Teacher Preparation, Charleston 5.

WISCONSIN. R. F. Lewis, First Asst. Superintendent, Madison.

WYOMING. Henry F. Chadey, Asst. Superintendent of Instruction, *Cheyenne.

Note: Asterisk signifies: Department of Public Instruction. Address all others c/o State Department of Education.

MUNICIPAL STANDARDS OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION IN THE MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

This survey of qualifications for the teaching of modern foreign languages in the public secondary schools of twenty-two major cities in the United States is a supplement to the study of State certification standards conducted as a part of the Statistical Research Project of the Modern Language Association under the National Defense Education Act.

Although several studies have been made of State certification requirements by professional organizations of foreign language teachers, none had examined city standards, nor do these special qualifications appear in the Manual on Certification (National Education Association). The reason for this lack of general information is that theoretically city certification requirements cannot differ from those of their States. But in practice this only means that the municipalities cannot require fewer credit hours than the State. However, since salaries and conditions of employment may be more attractive in the large cities, some cities set additional qualifications for city employment and competitive tests for selection.

To determine which cities have employment standards above the minimum requirements set by their States, State Boards of Education were asked for the names of cities which had these special requirements. Of twenty-six cities reported by their States, twenty-two were found, upon direct inquiry, to have foreign language requirements in excess of the State minimum. There were many others which subjected their applicants to National Teacher Examinations but, since the foreign language part of these examinations has been eliminated, only those cities which had special foreign language selection procedures were chosen for the survey.

Here are the facts obtained from these twenty-two cities, all of which responded to the inquiry. The data were resubmitted after a tentative tabulation. As far as it is possible to determine, this information is, therefore, accurate as of 1 June 1960. Explanation of the abbreviations will facilitate the reading of the chart.

Explanation of Abbreviated Terms

M. St. R. - Minimum FL State requirements for secondary school FL teachers

M. C. R. - Minimum FL city requirements for employment as FL teacher in the municipality

W. E. - Written examination

T. or I. - Test or interview

C. E. - College endorsement

X. E. - Non-specified endorsement of oral competency

G. - Graduate credit

H. S. - Maximum credit allowance for FL study in high school

	M.St.R.	M.C.R.	W.E.	Oral Approval T. or I.	C.E.	X.E.	FIES R.	Conditions of Employment for FL Teachers Educated Abroad
ALASKA	15							
Fairbanks		20						
Juneau		16				x	x	
ARIZONA	15							
Phoenix		30						provisional certificate
Tucson		24			x			
CALIFORNIA	24							
Los Angeles		24 + 30G[1]	x	x				
San Diego		36 + 30G[1]				x	x	waiver possible
San Francisco		24		x[2]	x			
DELAWARE	24							
Wilmington		24	x	x	x			
IDAHO	15							
Boise		15[3]				x		
ILLINOIS	6HS +10							
Chicago		32	x		x			endorsement of col.in U.S.
LOUISIANA	24							
Orleans Parish School Board		24	x	x	x			
MARYLAND	18							
Baltimore City		6 H.S. + 18		x				waiver &/or postponement of requirements
MASSACHUSETTS	18							
Boston		18	x	x				citizenship & M.A.
Worcester		18 + 30G[1]		x			x	Fulbright exchange teachers only
NEW JERSEY	18							
Jersey City		18	x	x			x	
Newark		6 H.S. + 18	x	x				
NEW YORK	18							
Buffalo		24	x	x	x		x	equivalence evaluated
New York City[4]		36	x	x				equivalence evaluated
OREGON	20							
Portland		20				x		standardization of degree citizenship[5]
PENNSYLVANIA	18							
Philadelphia		18	x	x			x	special examination
Pittsburgh		18	x		x		x	effective in 1963
WASHINGTON, D.C.		30[6]	x	x				

1 Not necessarily all in the field of foreign languages
2 Includes questions on subject matter
3 Actual average: 21 semester credit hours
4 12 semester credit hours may be taken in another language. A classroom teaching test is an additional requirement.
5 At least a declaration of intent is required.
6 M.A. required

What Do The Figures Mean

Of the twenty-two cities, twelve exceed the credit-hour requirements of their States: Fairbanks, Juneau, Phoenix, Tucson, Los Angeles, San Diego, Chicago, Baltimore, Worcester, Newark, Buffalo, and New York, whose thirty-six hours is twice the present State requirement. Twelve have written examinations to test foreign language proficiency (Los Angeles, Wilmington, Chicago, New Orleans, Boston, Jersey City, Newark, Buffalo, New York City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Washington) although no State includes such a test in its requirements for certification. Thirteen require an oral examination or interview to test audio-lingual competence: Los Angeles, San Francisco, Wilmington, New Orleans, Baltimore, Boston, Worcester, Jersey City, Newark, Buffalo, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. Ten of these (all except San Francisco, Baltimore, and Worcester) require both an oral and written test. New York City requires in addition a classroom teaching test. Of the other nine cities, seven require of the applicant some other proof of oral competency such as a letter of recommendation from the college which trained the candidate, attesting his audio-lingual proficiency.

This oral and written testing appears often to be motivated by the need to establish priority lists rather than by the desire to impose standards above those of the State or to question the validity of the grades of the sponsoring institution. However, as it is the result rather than the purpose which affects the quality of instruction thereby obtained, the screening in these major cities significantly changes the general certification picture. When these cities are taken into account, with the large number of schools and the percentage of the student population they control, the standards for the teaching of foreign languages assume a considerably higher level in the examination of the total data.

Since the initiative to raise standards frequently comes from these cities and since, in the employment of foreign language teachers, they are able to undertake more direct and stricter scrutiny of qualifications than their State Departments of Education, it is erroneous to make any generalizations or to draw any conclusions concerning the status of foreign language instruction in the public school system of the United States without taking cognizance of the standards which these cities maintain in the employment of foreign language teachers.

The following persons contributed the data contained in this report:

ALASKA — Fairbanks: James C. Ryan, Supt. of Fairbanks Schools.
Juneau: Sterling S. Sears, Supt. of Juneau Schools.

ARIZONA — Phoenix: Donald A. Golden, Personnel Manager, H.S. & College Dist.
Tucson: Thomas L. Lee, Asst. Supt. of Schools.

CALIFORNIA — Los Angeles: H. W. Baldwin, Supervisor, Certificated Selection Dept., Board of Ed.; Ruth Ginsburg, Supervisor, L.A. Schools
San Diego: Margit MacRae, Asst. Supervisor, Spanish, San Diego Schools.
San Francisco: Ward M. Nichols, Personnel Coordinator, San Francisco United School District.

DELAWARE — Wilmington: Edward L. Whigham, Asst. Supt. of Schools, Wilmington Public Schools.

IDAHO — Boise: George H. Fields, Asst. Supt. of Boise Public Schools.

ILLINOIS — Chicago: Robert L. Reinsch, Vice Chairman, Board of Examiners, Board of Ed.

LOUISIANA — New Orleans: Alfred B. Hebeisen, Director of Personnel, New Orleans Public Schools.

MARYLAND — Baltimore: Otto K. Schmied, Supervisor, FLs, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS — Boston: Philip J. Bond, Office of the Supt., Board of Ed.
Worcester: James W. McKenna, Asst. Supt. of Personnel Services, Public Schools of Worcester.

NEW JERSEY — Jersey City: James E. Reynolds, Supt. of Schools, Board of Ed.
Newark: Leon Mones, Asst. Supt., Board of Ed.

NEW YORK — Buffalo: Erwin Dingman, Coordinator of Personnel, Board of Ed.
New York City: Arthur Klein, Examiner, Board of Examiners, Board of Ed.; Ann Efros, Asst. to Examiner Klein.

OREGON — Portland: Ralph W. Bassett, Supervisor, FLs, Curriculum Division, Portland Public Schools.

PENNSYLVANIA — Philadelphia: Allen H. Wetter, Supt. of Schools, Board of Public Ed.
Pittsburgh: John P. Schaefer, Director, Division of Personnel, Board of Ed.

WASHINGTON D. C.
Marjorie Percy Bowen, Supervising Director, Public Schools of D. C. (office in Fillmore School)

THE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE EIEMENTARY SCHOOLS (FLES)

In view of the nation-wide increase in the teaching of foreign languages on the elementary school level, it is of grave concern in our profession to know who is teaching FLES. For the first time, therefore, in its studies of State certification practices for the employment of teachers of foreign languages in the public schools, the Modern Language Association has included a survey of standards and qualifications governing FLES teaching. Its inquiry has brought returns from al l fifty States; and the following explanations, charts, and descriptions are the tangible information derived from the investigation.

PART I

Who is teaching FLES? The teaching manpower in this area of foreign language instruction can be classified into three groups:

1. Certified secondary school teachers with varying degrees of knowledge of the psychology and practices pertaining to elementary school teaching.

2. Certified elementary school teachers with varying degrees of knowledge of the foreign language taught.

3. Non-certified personnel employed as specialists.[1]

   a. Natives with varying degrees of academic training.
   b. Parents drawn from P.T.A. organizations and with varying degrees of foreign language fluency.
   c. College professors of foreign languages serving on an experimental basis.

The charts in PART II give a graphic classification of the information received from the Directors of Teacher Certification of the individual States. The basis of the classification is as follows:

1. States which consider the setting of requirements or the drawing up of standards as premature. For these States, FLES is still in an experimental stage; its permanence in the elementary school curriculum is deemed doubtful or questionable. The names of these States are checked in Chart I, last column.

2. States which have requirements for FLES certification in their statutes. These States can be grouped according to types:

   a) Those which have general procedures whereby one type of certificate can be endorsed for another level of teaching. These regulations, not specifically designed for teachers of foreign languages, make it nonetheless possible for secondary school teachers of foreign languages to qualify for

---

1 In the State of Washington this type of employment may receive provisional certification. See description in PART III.

an elementary school certificate by taking a number of credit hours in professional education. This endorsement procedure applies particularly to teachers already employed in the public school system. It contains also a reverse provision whereby elementary school teachers of foreign languages may have their certificates endorsed for secondary school teaching of their subject.

b) Two States, Iowa and Ohio, have specific certification requirements especially designed for those intending to become teachers of FLES. (See descriptions in Part III.) These regulations contain two types of certification, making it possible for teachers trained on both elementary and secondary school levels to qualify as teachers of foreign languages.

c) Nevada has three types of certification programs qualifying FLES teachers as in 2a (above) and also certifying them as teachers of special subjects, thus viewing the knowledge of a foreign language as a special skill on the same basis as music and art. (See description in Part III.)

d) Five States, Georgia, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania, do not subject FLES certification to any new special regulations , on the assumption that existing requirements for certification of secondary school teachers of foreign languages can be said to apply without variation to the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary grades. This approach implies--without making an issue of it--that FLES teachers are to be considered teachers of special subjects.

3. States that employ FLES teachers according to one or more of the above sets of requirements, but without having as yet incorporated them into their statutes. They consider these requirements conditions or practices of employment, which are to be left to the discretion of the superintendents or principals who are assuming the responsibility of appointing FLES teachers. It may be pointed out that this practice is in reality prevalent even in those States which theoretically have certification requirements in their statutes but cannot wholly enforce them because of the shortage of fully qualified candidates.

4. States, a considerable number of them, which recognize the problem and, mindful of the need for establishing some standards and qualifications for teachers of FLES, have organized committees to work out specifications based on acceptable minimums.

Many of these States have sought the counsel and cooperation of local foreign language specialists on the high school and college levels and given them membership on their committees. Some of these commissions are still in the early stages of planning, others have formulated concrete proposals which they have submitted to their State Boards of Education. Some of these proposals have already been acted upon and will go into effect within the next year. Maryland and West Virginia have the most specific and comprehensive ones reported to date in answer to our inquiry. (See description in Part III.)

Explanation of Abbreviated Terms

FL:	Foreign languages
FLES:	Foreign languages in elementary schools
FLSS:	Foreign languages in secondary schools
Pr.Ed.	Professional education
Hrs.	Semester hours (information given in quarter hours has been recomputed in semester hours)

PART II

CHART I

	Same FL Requirements for Elem. as for Sec. School	Elem. Spec. & Emergency Cert.	Elem. Cert. & FL Requirement	Sec. Cert. Endorsed for FLES	Multiple Forms of Certification	Practices of Employment without special FL Endorsement on Elem. Cert.	Plans for Certification	No Requirements, no Immediate Plans	
1. Alabama								x	
2. Alaska							x		
3. Arizona								x	
4. Arkansas								x	
5. California								x	
6. Colorado								x	
7. Connecticut							x		
8. Delaware							x		
9. Florida								x	
10. Georgia	x								
11. Hawaii								x	
12. Idaho								x	
13. Illinois								x	
14. Indiana	x			x			x		
15. Iowa			x	x	x				
16. Kansas							x		
17. Kentucky						x			
18. Louisiana							x		
19. Maine						x			
20. Maryland							x		
21. Massachusetts							x		
22. Michigan						x		x	
23. Minnesota							x		
24. Mississippi							x		
25. Missouri	x		x						
26. Montana								x	
27. Nebraska	x								
28. Nevada		x	x	x	x				
29. New Hampshire							x		
30. New Jersey				x					
31. New Mexico	x								
32. New York							x		
33. North Carolina								x	
34. North Dakota	x								
35. Ohio	x	x	x	x	x				
36. Oklahoma								x	
37. Oregon			x						
38. Pennsylvania	x								
39. Rhode Island						x	x		
40. South Carolina								x	

PART II

	Same FL Requirements for Elem. as for Sec. School	Elem. Spec. & Emergency Cert.	Elem. Cert. & FL Requirement	Sec. Cert. Endorsed for FLES	Multiple Forms of Certification	Practices of Employment without Specific FL Endorsement on Elem. Cert.	Plans for Certification	No Requirements, no Immediate Plans	
41. South Dakota			x						
42. Tennessee				x					
43. Texas						x			
44. Utah						x			
45. Vermont		x	x	x	x				
46. Virginia								x	
47. Washington		x							
48. West Virginia		x	x	x	x		x		
49. Wisconsin			x						
50. Wyoming				x					
Totals	8	5	9	9	5	6	14	15	

Same Requirements for FIES as for FLSS	Elem. School Cert. plus FL Requirement	Sec. School Cert.(1) Endorsed for Elem. School Teaching by Addition of Pr. Ed. Courses for Elem. School Level	Problem of FIES Certification Under Advisement
Georgia	Iowa: 15 hrs.(or 12 plus HS units)	Indiana: non-specified endorsement	Alaska: elem. cert. & 2 yrs. FL
Indiana	Missouri: 15 hrs.	Iowa: 8 hrs. of Pr. Ed.	Connecticut
Missouri	Nevada: 24 hrs.	Nevada: non-specified endorsement	Delaware: dual plan—el.cert. plus 12 hrs. FL or sec.cert. plus Pr. Ed.
Nebraska*	Ohio*: 20 hrs.	New Jersey: non-specified endorsement	Indiana
New Mexico	Oregon: non-specified endorsement plus FL methods course	Ohio*: about 9 hrs. of Pr.Ed.	Kansas: modern FL advisory committee
North Dakota	So.Dakota: 15 hrs.	Tennessee: non-specified endorsement	Louisiana
Ohio	Vermont: 24 hrs.	Vermont: 6 hrs. of Pr. Ed.	Maryland*
Pennsylvania	West Va.: 15 hrs.(to be raised to 18 hrs.)	West Va.: non-specified endorsement for "emergency certificates"	Massachusetts: state advisory committee of FL
Elem. School Special Cert.	Wisconsin: 15 hrs.	Wyoming: non-specified endorsement	Minnesota
Nevada*			Mississippi: advisory council on teacher certification
Ohio	**Current Practice of Employment without Special FLES Cert.**		
Vermont	Kentucky: minor FL (12 hrs)	Rhode Island: 15 hrs.	New Hampshire: committee on teacher ed. & prof. standards
Washington*	Maine: 12 hrs.& elem. cert. or sec. cert.& Pr.Ed. courses	Texas: "authentic & fluent speaking command of language taught"	New York: state-wide study on cert. of elem. ed.
West Virginia	Michigan: non-specified no.of hrs. of FL studied	Utah: "various amounts of FL"	Rhode Island: non-specified committee
			West Virginia*

*See Part III

(1) For number of required credit FL hrs., see Report on State Certification Standards.

PART III

Description of programs starred in Chart II:

Nebraska. The most flexible type of FLES certification is exemplified in the Nebraska Handbook on Teacher Certification(1 Dec. 1959),which reads: "The holder of a Nebraska Secondary School Certificate with specialization in the fields of music, art, foreign language, special education, physical education, health education, and vocational education is also entitled to instruct or assist in his respective field or fields of specialization in all the elementary school grades."

Nevada. The teacher of foreign languages in the elementary schools can acquire certification through three different channels: (1) If he is already an elementary school teacher of general subjects, he can have this certificate endorsed for a foreign language by acquiring 24 hours of formal foreign language training. (2) If he is already a foreign language teacher on the secondary school level, he can have the secondary school certificate endorsed for elementary school teaching of his major subject by adding the courses in professional education which pertain to elementary school teaching. (3) The third manner of certification classifies foreign languages under "special subjects" along with music, art, industrial arts, and physical education; the holders of special certificates are presumed to teach only their special subject and therefore the only credentials they need are those "showing adequate preparation for teaching the particular subject or subjects designated and evidence of personal fitness for the work." Twenty-four semester credit hours in the subject, or the equivalent, are designated as a requirement. This implies, at the same time, ease of certification and screening for competency in the applicant's field.

Ohio. The certification system for foreign language teachers for the elementary grades is varied, according to the directive of 16 Dec. 1959 issued by the Director of Certification, Mr. Albert C. May. For a temporary certificate to teach the language, the holder of a certificate to teach a foreign language on another level needs only the request of the local school or school system. However, if he wishes a permanent endorsement of his previous certificate, or an additional "special" certificate, he has to comply with other regulations. For a permanent validation of an elementary school certificate he must add to his training in elementary school general education 20 hours in the foreign language and a course in "Methods of Teaching Modern Foreign Languages." If the elementary school teacher holds the B.A. degree, he can, by adding the above training, obtain not an endorsement but an additional "special" certificate which will qualify him to teach the foreign language in grades 1-12, thus bridging the gap between elementary and secondary teaching. The holder of a secondary school certificate for the teaching of foreign languages must, on the other hand, add courses in "Child Psychology", "Purposes and Practices of Elementary Education", as well as a course in "Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages", to obtain the "special" certificate valid for grades 1-12. This implies that he may have been teaching the foreign language on the secondary school level without having had a "methods" course, but that this course is considered a requirement for the teaching of language on the elementary level.

Washington. Although the State of Washington has as yet no provisions for the general certification of FLES teachers, it put into effect beginning with the 1959-60 school year a procedure for special certification of persons highly qualified in a specific field who may not be able to meet the general requirements for certification. This is an annual certificate grant for "special and specific instructional functions other than regular full-time teaching." Such appointments are left to the discretion of the local school boards of districts but are to be encouraged as a means of enrichment of the school program. This method would facilitate the entrance of native speakers of the foreign language into the public school system on a temporary basis until such time as they might meet other education requirements for certification.

Provisions of proposed plans for FLES certification starred in Chart II.

Maryland. The proposals reported by Mrs. Genevieve S. Blew, Supervisor of Instruction in Modern Foreign Languages, include provisions for certification of elementary and secondary teachers who already hold other certificates, college graduates without teaching experience, foreign teachers, and foreign non-degree applicants for FLES positions. To qualify as a FLES teacher every applicant must demonstrate competency in the language, either by presentation of credit hours or by a statement issued by a college or university after an oral interview by a native speaker. He must also have taken Methods of Teaching in the Elementary School. In addition, all prospective teachers, with the exception of the fully certificated elementary teachers, must take one course in each of the following: child psychology, elementary curriculum, and student teaching. Successful experience in teaching modern foreign language at the elementary level may be substituted for this practice teaching. This would not reduce the professional education requirements, which would total 18 hours in every case. Holders of degrees from abroad must show proof of the academic equivalence of the American B.A. and comply with the same requirements for holders of American degrees. The proposal for the foreign non-degree applicant is to meet the present emergency need and will be reviewed for possible revision or elimination at a later date.

West Virginia. The Certification Director of West Virginia, Miss Genevieve Starcher, reports that current regulations for the certification of FLES teachers are considered an "expediency of certification" and that a new plan for approved programs in the training of foreign language teachers for grades one through twelve has been drafted, although a date for its inception has not yet been set. The plan pertains to the preparation of FLES teachers rather than to the retraining of those already holding certificates. Two such programs are being considered, one for foreign language specialists in all grades, with a minimum of 24 hours in foreign language together with appropriate methods and student teaching for the two levels; the other consists of the standard junior high school curriculum in which the elective credits would be used to build up at least 18 hours of foreign language training.

Programs for intensive, emergency training of FLES teachers

Several States which have not yet legally recognized FLES as an integral part of the curriculum and have, therefore, no formal certification requirements, report special State-sponsored training programs for FLES teachers. (These

are to be distinguished from the numerous university workshops and federally sponsored institutes.)

California. In the report of the Conference on Foreign Languages held by the California State Department of Education on 15-16 Jan, at Sacramento, sent to us by Miss Helen Heffernan, Chief of the Bureau of Elementary Education, there are recommendations for in-service courses jointly sponsored by boards of education and local universities. These courses would include practice in the conversational aspects of the language and familiarity with teaching methods and materials. The first term of this work would be taken before the applicant begins to teach the foreign language in the elementary school and would be followed by supervision by the college instructor when the applicant begins to teach. About every six weeks there would be workshops for follow-up discussion of ideas and the demonstration of methods and equipment, conducted by the college specialist and attended by the teachers participating in the FLES project of their school.[1]

Florida. Local in-service programs to develop the competency of FLES teachers are reported in one fourth of the counties of the State; among these are both credit and non-credit courses.

Massachusetts. As a part of the Modern Language Project of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, the Television program entitled "Parlons Français" devotes its Monday afternoon sessions to the "reviving" of the FLES teacher's previous knowledge of the foreign language. The program provides language drill as well as information concerning content and materials of the FLES curriculum and effective methods of instruction.

Missouri. The Springfield Public Schools are sponsoring, with the cooperation of the State consultant in modern foreign languages, a four-weeks intensive training course for sixty elementary school teachers who will be teaching FLES in the coming academic year.

CONCLUSIONS

Many factors are involved in the general lack of specific standards and certification regulations pertaining to FLES. They can be summarized as follows:

1. The shortage of qualified teachers.

2. Administrators' uncertainty as to the educational validity of FLES instruction as an integral part of the elementary school curriculum.

3. Guidance to supervisors of curriculum from teacher preparation centers and foreign language specialists.

The actual certification requirements that come out of these mutual deliberations will largely depend on the decisions taken concerning the two basic issues discussed below.

I. Is the language instruction to be part of the general classroom procedure, or is it to be specialized training given by an expert who will do no other form of teaching in the school?

---

1 Under the National Defense Education Act the California State Department of Education has scheduled workshops for FLES teachers for the summer of 1960.

Miss Helen Heffernan, Chief of the Bureau of Elementary Education of the California State Board of Education, believes that "a special teacher is not absolutely essential", for the foreign language "is viewed not as a special subject in the elementary school curriculum, but as a part of the social living and varied experiences of the children in school and in their community"[1]

According to this concept, the FLES instruction would not consist of formal training but would be integrated with other classroom teaching, so that as far as progress is concerned there would be no transferable credit evaluation when a child moves from one community into another. This kind of training would, therefore, give no more advanced standing to the pupil who is going on to high school than his experience with history or science in the self-contained classroom in the elementary school.

On the other hand, some educators believe that the foreign language instruction should be given in a special class section, on a more formal basis, and its objective should be the development at an early age of a permanent skill in the child rather than be intended as a vague attribute to the general development of his personality. Viewed thus, FLES is a specialized subject like music and art and should be handled strictly by a specialist engaged by the school solely for the purpose of teaching the foreign language courses. With this form of instruction the pupil's progress in the foreign language could be measured independently of his general grade level, and consequent adjustments made in the transfer from one school to another. When the pupil reached the high school level, his knowledge of the foreign language could be evaluated for advanced placement.

Those who adhere to this second concept generally believe in the replacement of the self-contained classroom by departmentalization in the elementary school, or separate subject instruction in at least some areas of the curriculum.

It is obvious that either one or the other of these two premises will prevail in the drafting of certification requirements for FLES.

II. Should FLES certification requirements be formulated primarily to facilitate the endorsement or readjustment of already existing certificates, or should they pertain more specifically to teaching candidates expressly trained for this new field?

Most existing requirements provide for the retraining of teachers. But in some States (Maryland, West Virginia) which rely temporarily on practices rather than on legal certification regulations, it is felt that, before effective regulations can be worked out for newly trained FLES teachers, universities and teachers colleges will have to develop programs to serve as criteria for State standards of certification.

One way of encouraging academic programs for FLES teachers would be to have State Boards of Education set a-priori requirements for certification, for public school teaching candidates, concerned with the practical factors controlling their employment, are more likely to turn to the State Board than to the academic institutions to ascertain standards for qualification.

---

1 "Looking ahead in Foreign Languages in the Elementary School Curriculum," Bureau of Elementary Education, Jan. 1960.

PART IV

The figures of credit hour requirements and descriptions of content of FLES course requirements were subjected to a final check by having the information sent back for verification to the officers of the State Boards of Education who had originally supplied it. The large number of changes reported make it clear that this is a field of certification where revision is the norm. These figures, therefore, describe a trend rather than a status.

In view of this uncertainty and fluctuation, it was decided that the report would be much more valuable if it could be accompanied by a set of recommendations from a body of experts. Consequently, a meeting was called by the Research Center to define basic standards and formulate recommendations embodying them. Where for practical reasons it was not feasible to have geographical representation, every attempt was made to include on the advisory committee representatives of all the educational categories connected in various degrees with the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools. The list of those sponsoring the recommendations will indicate the breadth of the representation.

Resolution of the Advisory Committee on the FLES Certification Survey

After examining a preliminary report on the certification of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School, an advisory committee met under the auspices of the MLA-FL Program Research Center to analyze existing FLES qualifications and to define minimum standards for foreign language teaching in the elementary schools. The group was representative both of foreign language specialization and of elementary education. It was stipulated at the outset that it was not the responsibility of the committee to pass judgment on the desirability of including FLES as a part of the elementary program, but since FLES is in fact in operation, the committee's task was to establish guidelines for the qualifications of teachers of modern foreign languages in the elementary schools. The group discussed the successes and failures of FLES from three points of view: 1) effective language study, 2) its place in the total elementary curriculum, 3) its effects on the development of the child in his learning experience. The committee agreed on some basic standards, which are presented so that State Departments of Education, in the course of their own deliberations on criteria for FLES certification, may be able to refer to the minimum qualifications endorsed by a group representing both elementary and foreign language education and familiar with the present status of FLES certification throughout the country.

It is suggested:

1. That in addition to the B.A. degree or its established equivalent, the applicant be required to demonstrate, before a validating agency, specific evidence of competency in the spoken language: a good pronunciation, facility and accuracy in oral communication.

2. That the applicant complete, as prerequisites to the teaching of a foreign language in grades one through six, at least one course in each of the following areas: 1) Child Psychology, 2) The Elementary School Curriculum, 3) Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages in the Elementary School.

If it is felt that, in some instances, exception must be made, the completion of the course on child psychology should in any event be mandatory, and a time-limit be set for the completion of the other two.

3. That the applicant complete, as a prerequisite to the teaching of a foreign language in grades one through six, a course in supervised student teaching of FLES including observation of elementary school teaching in general, under the auspices of an accredited college approved for the preparation of teachers. Exception should be made only when the first year's teaching of the foreign language is done under the supervision of qualified elementary school personnel. It is understood that these minimum standards are considered "transitional" by the committee, and acceptable only until such time as institutions of higher education which train teachers establish specific programs of study designed for teacher candidates specializing both in elementary education and a foreign language. It is further suggested that State Boards of Education encourage such institutions to introduce this type of curriculum as soon as feasible.

Endorsing the Recommendations:

Dora Bashour, Department of Romance Languages, Director, Language Laboratory, Hunter College

Genevieve S. Blew, Supervisor of Instruction, Foreign Languages, Maryland State Department of Education

John Day, District Superintendent, New Hyde Park Public Schools, N. Y.

Emilio Guerra, High School Division, New York City Board of Education

Judith Dranes, Department of Elementary Education, School of Education, N.Y.U.

James S. LeSure, Consultant, Teacher Certification, Conn. State Department of Education

Gladys Lipton, Foreign Language Specialist for New York City Public Elementary Schools

Alda Pizzinger, President, Association of Foreign Language Chairmen, Nassau County High Schools, Long Island, N. Y.

David Salten, Superintendent, Long Beach Public Schools, Long Beach, N. Y.

Nila B. Smith, Director, The Reading Institute, N. Y. U.

Charles Snyder, Chairman, Department of Romance Languages, State University College of Education, Potsdam, N. Y.

Perry M. Sturges, Chairman, Department of Languages, Collegiate School, New York, N. Y.

Vera Villegas de Galante, Foreign Language Supervisor, Hicksville Public Schools, Long Island, N. Y.

From The Foreign Language Program Research Center

Donald D. Walsh, Director, Foreign Language Program Research Center, MLA

Wesley Childers, Director of Research, MLA, and Chairman of the Department of Foreign Languages, State University College of Education, Albany, N. Y.

Mary J. Ollmann, Research Associate, MLA

Chairman of Committee: Anna Balakian, Research Associate, MLA, and Department of Foreign Languages, School of Education, N. Y. U.

The following persons contributed the data on certification contained in this report:

ALABAMA: Lulu Palmer, Supervisor of Instruction, Montgomery 4.

ALASKA: Herbert Bruce, Ed. Supervisor, Science, Math., FLs, Juneau.

ARIZONA. C. B. Coor, Director of Secondary Ed., *Phoenix.

ARKANSAS. Wilma Jimerson, Supervisor of MFLs, Little Rock.

CALIFORNIA. Helen Heffernan, Chief, Bureau of Elementary Ed., Sacramento 14.

COLORADO. Otto G. Ruff, Director of Teacher Ed. & Cert., Denver 2.

CONNECTICUT. James S. LeSure, Consultant, Teacher Cert., Hartford 15.

DELAWARE. Elizabeth C. Lloyd, Director of Cert., *Dover.

FLORIDA. Sara de Keni, Consultant in Elementary Ed., Tallahassee.

GEORGIA. Jack P. Nix, Supervisor of Cert., Atlanta 3.

HAWAII. Erwin Gordon, Director, FLs, *Honolulu.

IDAHO. Jane J. Scott, Supervisor of MFLs, Boise.

ILLINOIS. Robert O. de Vette, Consultant, FLs, *Springfield.

INDIANA. Ernest A. Smith, Director, Teacher Training & Licensing, *Indianapolis.

IOWA. Wayland W. Osborn, Director, Div. of Teacher Ed. & Cert.,*Des Moines 19.

KANSAS. Maurice E. Cook, Supervisor in Accreditation, Elementary Ed., *Topeka.

KENTUCKY. W. E. Adams, Supervisor, Elementary Ed., Frankfort.
Sidney Simandle, Asst. Director, Teacher Ed. & Cert., Frankfort.

LOUISIANA. Charles J. Faulk, Elementary Supervisor, Baton Rouge 4.

MAINE. Nita Barbour, Supervisor, MFLs, Augusta.

MARYLAND. Genevieve S. Blew, State Supervisor of Instruction, MFLs, Baltimore 1.

MASSACHUSETTS. Margaret A. Shea, Senior Supervisor, Elementary Ed., Boston 16.

MICHIGAN. Karl R. Kramer, Consultant, Elementary Ed., *Lansing.

MINNESOTA. Marian Drake, Elementary Schools Consultant, St. Paul 1.

MISSISSIPPI. E. Harold Fisher, State Supervisor of Elementary Ed., Jackson.

MISSOURI. H. Pat Wardlaw, Asst. Commissioner, Div. of Instruction, Jefferson City.

MONTANA. Lester W. McKim, State Supervisor of FLs, Helena.

NEBRASKA. Clara M. McClatchey, Consultant in Elementary Ed., Lincoln 9.

NEVADA. Charles O. Ryan, Deputy Superintendent, Carson City.

NEW HAMPSHIRE. John Economopoulos, Director, Elementary School Services, Concord.

NEW JERSEY. Allan F. Rosebrock, Director of Teacher Ed., Trenton 25.

NEW MEXICO. La Mar Lamb, Director, Div. of Cert. & Teacher Placement, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK. Helen Hay Heyl, Chief, Elementary Curriculum Development, Albany 1.
Vincent C. Gazzetta, Associate in Teacher Cert., Albany 1.

NORTH CAROLINA. Mary Alice Poor, Supervisor of Cert., *Raleigh.
NORTH DAKOTA. Lorene York, Director of Cert., *Bismarck.
OHIO. Albert C. May, Director Teacher Ed., Columbus 15.
B. C. Miller, Div. of Cert., Columbus 15.
Ruth Hudson, Supervisor of Elementary Curriculum, Columbus 15.

OKLAHOMA. E. H. Bingham, Director of Cert., Oklahoma City.

OREGON. Dick Sorick, Director, Teacher Ed. & Cert., Salem.

PENNSYLVANIA. J. F. Meistor, Acting Director, Teacher Cert., *Harrisburg.

RHODE ISLAND. William P. Robinson, Deputy Commissioner of Ed., Providence 3.

SOUTH CAROLINA. S. C. Hawkins, Supervisor, Teacher Ed., & Cert., Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA. Tillie Snyder, Director of Cert., *Pierre.

TENNESSEE. W. E. Turner, Coordinator, Div. of Instruction, Nashville 3.

TEXAS. Anthony R. Ferris, Consultant, MFLs, Texas Ed. Agency, Austin.

UTAH. Jennie W. Kearl, State Director, Elementary Ed., *Salt Lake City 14.

VERMONT. Newton H. Baker, Director, Teacher Ed. & Cert., Montpelier.

VIRGINIA. A. G. Richardson, Associate Supervisor, Elementary & Secondary Ed., Richmond.

WASHINGTON. Nels W. Hanson, Supervisor, Science, Math, FLs, *Olympia.

WEST VIRGINIA. R. Neil Chenoweth, Supervisor, Elementary Instruction, Charleston.
Genevieve Starcher, Director, Teacher Preparation, Charleston 5.

WISCONSIN. H. I. Peterson, School Supervisor, Madison 2.

WYOMING. H. F. Chadey, Asst. Superintendent for Instruction, *Cheyenne.

Note: Asterisk accompanying address signifies: Department of Public Instruction. Address all others c/o State Department of Education.